

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

January 22, 2004 LB 526, 602, 821, 824, 835-837, 850, 916

CLERK: Mr. President, additional priority bill designations: Senator Erdman, LB 526; Senator Burling, LB 916. A hearing notice from the Retirement Systems Committee. Your Committee on Agriculture reports LB 835, LB 836, LB 837 to General File, these reports signed by Senator Kremer. Government Committee reports LB 821, LB 824 to General File, those reports signed by Senator Schimek. I have confirmation report from Natural Resources. An amendment to be printed by Senator Mossey to LB 850. That's all that I had, Mr. President. (Legislative Journal pages 365-367.)

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. The next five senators wishing to speak: Senators Maxwell, Erdman, Redfield, Chambers, and Janssen. Senator Maxwell.

SENATOR MAXWELL: Thank you, Mr. President. I oppose the motion. I support the bill. This is a very good debate. I will try not to be redundant, cover ground that others have covered. I do want to respond to a few things I've heard. Want to see if I can bring my friend Senator Hartnett back around here on board. I want to pick up on the point that Senator Smith left off with, the criminalizing knowledge, banning knowledge. That's not what's going on here. This is not an antiknowledge bill. What it's banning is creating human life for the purpose of cannibalizing it for medical experimentation. Now, before anybody gets...cannibalizing, what, that doesn't have anything to do with the eating of human flesh. It's a term that means breaking something down into units and then taking a unit and incorporating it into something else, which, my understanding is that's what we would do with stem cells is you'd take them and then incorporate them into someone else so they can help an injured part of the body regenerate. So let's be precise, but that is what we're talking about. We're talking about creating a human being to cannibalize it for medical research, for medical experimentation. That's what the bill would ban. It is not antiknowledge. We are using knowledge to make a policy decision. Part of scientific inquiry, part of intellectual freedom, is to explore a possible path of research, like a surveyor for a team of exploration, Lewis and Clark or something. You go out, you scout out the landscape. And it is perfectly legitimate, it is a legitimate intellectual exercise